



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,574	01/28/2005	Hermann Grether	SMB-PT124 (PC 03 404 B US	1426
3624 7590 04/30/2009 VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER GORMAN, DARREN W	
			ART UNIT 3752	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/30/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/523,574

Applicant(s)

GRETHER, HERMANN

Examiner

Darren W. Gorman

Art Unit

3752

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Darren W. Gorman (Examiner).(3) Christoph Weis (Assignee representative).(2) Robert Ballarini (Attorney for Applicant).(4) Len Tran (SPE 3752).

Date of Interview: 27 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: working model of faucet aerator shown.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nelson (USPN 4,730,786).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Ballarini and Mr. Weis described the structural differences of the instant invention in view of the prior art to Nelson. In particular, differences between the housing structures were discussed, as well as differences between the flow regulator of the instant invention in view of the element(s) of Nelson to which the Examiner applied the recited flow regulator. A proposal to amend the independent claim was introduced in view of the discussions.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Darren W Gorman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752